

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 13 and 22 have been amended and claims 32-35 have been added. No new matter has been submitted.

Claims 1-35 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In view of the above corrections of the typographical errors of claims 13 and 22, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Inoue et al., U.S. Publication No. 2001/0048472, in view of Tanaka et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,224,480. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of review and only as an example, independent claim 1 sets forth:

"A method of compressing image data comprising:

detecting a specified compression ratio corresponding to a printing mode selected by a user from compression ratios corresponding to a variety of printing modes; and

compressing the image data according to the detected specified compression ratio."

The Office Action sets forth that a combination of Inoue et al. and Tanaka et al. would sets forth all the features of the independent claims. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Inoue et al. sets forth a menu for users to control both the resolution and compression to be applied to captured images. Inoue et al. indicates that previous systems that only permitted separate controls of such controls were inadequate.

Thus, to overcome these inadequacies, Inoue et al. displays on a single menu both the resolution and available image qualities (compression amounts). In some embodiments Inoue et al. also displays the number of pictures that can be taken with the selected resolution and quality, based on the storage size of the camera, and may also display the available storage that will be left during a video recording based on the selected resolution and quality.

Thus, Inoue et al. is focused on permitting a user to select both the resolution and quality of future captured and stored images.

There is no disclosure or suggestion that such selections for recorded images should be based upon potential output to printers, or any appropriate resolution or compression desirable for such printers. Rather, again, Inoue et al. is solely focused on providing a user a single menu for initially selecting both the resolution and image quality for pictures to be recorded by the camera.

Differently, Tanaka et al. merely illustrates that a camera can output stored images to a printer and that a user can also generate information to be transferred to the printer for controlling what images are to be printed, how they're to be printed, which paper, etc.

Specifically, Tanaka et al. notes in col. 7, lines 60-65, that the designating of the print image by the camera in the arrangement of Tanaka et al. is the same as the creating of a DPOF file. The DPOF file would be stored in a separate location of the storage medium information identifying which pictures are to be printed (including their locations), any paper settings, any cropping, etc.

However, this DPOF file merely identifies the pictures and their locations.

Any combination of demonstrated printing operation of Tanaka et al. and the camera setting of Inoue et al. would be only for implementing both separate operations separately.

The initial setting operation of Inoue et al. is performed at a different time, i.e., before pictures are taken, than the picture selection operation of Tanaka et al.

Further, any compressing of any captured images in Inoue et al. would still be performed before any print selection operation discussed in Tanaka et al.

Tanaka et al. only teaches to implement a print operation similar to the selection of previously compressed images for printing. Further, Tanaka et al. only sets forth a similar discussion as that set forth in the background of the present application, i.e., that printers are required to implement the decompression and further compression for any requested printing.

In Tanaka et al., the DPOF file would indicate which already compressed files are to be transferred to the printer and how the printer is to print the same.

Thus, there is no disclosure or suggestion in either of Inoue et al. or Tanaka et al., alone or in combination, that the compression performed by Inoue et al. would or could be implemented to further a printing operation.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that such a combination of Inoue et al. and Tanaka et al. cannot disclose or suggest the claimed "detecting a specified compression ratio corresponding to a printing mode selected by a user from compression ratios corresponding to a variety of printing modes; and compressing the image data according to the detected specified compression ratio," as recited in claim 1. The remaining independent claims include similar allowable features, with differing scope and breadth.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 32-39 are also allowable over such a combination of Inoue et al. and Tanaka et al., as any such claimed compression operation would have to be performed by the printer of such a combination and the compression operations of Inoue et al. are not performed on previously compressed images.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of claims 1-31 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:

Stephen T. Bougner
Registration No. 45,317

Date: May 7, 2008

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501